

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank Ambassador Tóth: there at least is a constructive proposal. Does the way in which Mr. Tóth presented things help Mr. Batsanov to eliminate his doubts? While he is thinking about it, I call on the Ambassador of Algeria, Mr. Semichi.

Mr. SEMICHI (Algeria) (translated from French): Three uncertainties have emerged after what was said by the Ambassador of Pakistan and the Ambassador of the Russian Federation on the section of document CD/WP/428/Rev.1 relating to chemical weapons. I take paragraph 72: there is an uncertainty in the drafting that was partially removed by the Secretary-General himself, Mr. Berasategui, when he said earlier that the wording of paragraph 72 was identical to that of paragraph 75 and that the documents to which reference was made were those which had been submitted in 1992. I therefore suggest that the wording of paragraph 72 should be similar to that of paragraph 75. Next, in paragraph 73, there is an ambiguity between the report contained in document CD/1170, part I, and the annex to that report: we do not quite understand why paragraph 73 speaks of the report and gives its symbol - CD/1170 - whereas paragraph 74, dealing with the same document, refers only to the annex to that report. I think that paragraph 73 should specify that this report is reproduced in part I or paragraphs 1 to 42 or 43 of document CD/1170, the second part of which contains only the appendix. Those are the initial remarks that I will make just on the subject of the drafting of paragraphs 72, 73 and 74. The Algerian delegation reserves the right to take the floor later on the political implications of the last part of paragraph 74.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank Ambassador Semichi for his comments and suggestions. Concerning his first comment and the solution involving identical wording for paragraphs 72 and 75, I think that if we adopt the same wording and refer to 1992 in the paragraph on chemical weapons we may leave a gap, because, as Ambassador Tóth said, document CD/1170 also mentions documents which date from 1991. That is why the year 1992 was not referred to in document CD/WP.428/Rev.1. Consequently I think the solution would be to go along with the proposal made by Mr. Tóth and delete the word "new" in the phrase reading as follows: "The list of new documents presented to the Conference under the agenda item is contained in the report submitted ...". If we said simply "the list of documents presented to the Conference" that would cover both those which were presented previously and those presented more recently. I see that the representative of the United Kingdom, Sir Michael Weston, is the first to have asked for the floor on these points.

Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): I was going to concentrate first on paragraph 72. I think the trouble with Ambassador Tóth's suggestion is that the list may be rather long because presumably that will go back to the beginning of time, or at least to the beginning of the negotiations, so we shall have 24 years' worth of documents attached if we don't set some sort of time-limit. On the other hand, I take his point very much that if we refer only to 1992 we do not capture the 1991 documents, and so perhaps a solution would be to use the phrase "since the close of its 1991 session" and that would then bring in all documents which have appeared since the close of the last session in September of last year.